



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,108	03/31/2006	Peter Herold	2006-0446A	7425
513 7590 08/18/2009 WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P. 1030 15th Street, N.W., Suite 400 East Washington, DC 20005-1503				
EXAMINER				
HABTE, KAHISAY				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1624				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/18/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/574,108

Applicant(s)

HEROLD ET AL.

Examiner

Kahsay T. Habte

Art Unit

1624

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07/27/2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 11-21 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 11-21 are pending in this application.
2. Applicant's petition from the Restriction Requirement submitted on 07/27/2009 has been granted on 08/13/2009. Upon further review of the Restriction Requirement (09/19/2008) and the petition decision, it is deemed necessary to modify the original Restriction Requirement (election of species) that is not applicable to national stage filing of a PCT application (35 USC 371) .
3. The finality of the rejection of the last Office action (04/27/2009) is withdrawn. The withdrawal is due to the Petition Decision dated 08/13/2009.
4. The obviousness-type double patenting rejection raised in previous Office Actions over copending applications 11/887,227 and 12/076,221 has been withdrawn. The instant claims 11-21 don't contain a variable R group attached to the 2-position of the piperidine ring and is not obvious over copending applications 11/887,227 and 12/076,221. Note that rejection was raised in part because the filing date in the Bib data sheet for 11/887,227 shows as 01/01/0001 that is incorrect.

Continuity/Reexam Information for 11/887227

Parent Data

11887227, filed 01/01/0001 is a national stage entry of PCT/EP2006/061197, International Filing Date: 03/30/2006
PCT/EP2006/061197 Claims Priority from Provisional Application 60666556, filed 03/31/2005
PCT/EP2006/061197 Claims Priority from Provisional Application 60750853, filed 12/16/2005

Child Data

12076221, filed on 03/14/2008 is a division of 11887227, filed on 01/01/0001

Election/Restrictions

5. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 11-17 (in part), 18 and 19-21 (in part), drawn to benzo[1,3]oxazinyl and benzo[1,4]oxazinyl.

Group II, claim(s) 11-13 (in part), 15-17 (in part) and 19-21 (in part), drawn to pyrido[1,4]oxazinyl.

Group III, claim(s) 11-17 (in part) and 19-21 (in part), drawn to benzo[1,4]thiazinyl.

Group IV, claim(s) 11-13 (in part), 15-17 (in part) and 19-21 (in part), drawn to benzo[1,4]diazepinyl.

Group V, claim(s) 11-13 (in part), 15-17 (in part) and 19-21 (in part), drawn to phthalzinyl and quinoxalinyl.

Group VI, claim(s) 11-13 (in part), 15-17 (in part) and 19-21 (in part), drawn to thieno[2,3-d]pyrimidinyl.

Group VII, claim(s) 11-13 (in part), 15-17 (in part) and 19-21 (in part), drawn to azepanyl.

Group VIII, claim(s) 11-13 (in part), 15-17 (in part) and 19-21 (in part), drawn to triazinyl.

Group IX, claim(s) 11-13 (in part), 15-17 (in part) and 19-21 (in part), drawn to [1,5]naphthyridyl.

Group X, claim(s) 11-13 (in part), 15-17 (in part) and 19-21 (in part), drawn to pyrrolo[2,3-b]pyridyl.

Group XI, claim(s) 11-13 (in part), 15-17 (in part) and 19-21 (in part), drawn to piperidiny and pyridyl.

Group XII, claim(s) 11-17 (in part) and 19-21 (in part), drawn to others (any of the heterocyclic rings that are not encompassed by groups I-XI).

(f) "Markush practice" The situation involving the so-called Markush practice wherein a single claim defines alternatives (chemical or non-chemical) is also governed by PCT Rule 13.2. In this special situation, the requirement of a technical interrelationship and the same or corresponding special technical features as defined in PCT Rule 13.2, shall be considered to be met when the alternatives are of a similar nature.

(i) When the Markush grouping is for alternatives of chemical compounds, they shall be regarded as being of a similar nature where the following criteria are fulfilled:

(A) All alternatives have a common property or activity; and

(B) (1) A common structure is present, i.e., a significant structural element is shared by all of the alternatives; or

(B) (2) In cases where the common structure cannot be the unifying criteria, all alternatives belong to a recognized class of chemical compounds in the art to which the invention pertains.


In paragraph (f)(i)(B)(1), above, the words "significant structural element is shared by all of the alternatives" refer to cases where the compounds share a common chemical structure which occupies a large portion of their structures, or in case the compounds have in common only a small portion of their structures, the commonly shared structure constitutes a structurally distinctive portion in view of existing prior art, and the common structure is essential to the common property or activity. The different variables R1-R4, X, W, Z, n, m, etc. result in so many permutations giving both heterocyclic and non-hetero rings, different bonds between atoms, resulting in compounds that have achieved a different status in the art, and thus are drawn to an improper Markush group on the grounds of lack of a common nucleus. Thus lack of unity is apparent.

A preliminary search of a selected core gave numerous iterations, see below:

=>
Uploading C:\Program Files\Stnexp\Queries\10574108a.str

L1 STRUCTURE UPLOADED

=> d 11
L1 HAS NO ANSWERS
L1 SIR



Structure attributes must be viewed using STN Express query preparation.

=> s 11
SAMPLE SEARCH INITIATED 09:29:35 FILE 'REGISTRY'
SAMPLE SCREEN SEARCH COMPLETED - 97887 TO ITERATE

2.1% PROCESSED 2000 ITERATIONS 0 ANSWERS
INCOMPLETE SEARCH (SYSTEM LIMIT EXCEEDED)
SEARCH TIME: 00.00.01

FULL FILE PROJECTIONS: ONLINE **COMPLETE**
 BATCH **COMPLETE**
PROJECTED ITERATIONS: 1928186 TO 1965294
PROJECTED ANSWERS: 0 TO 0

L2 0 SEA 333 SAM L1

Thus it is clear that applicant's compound core is not applicant's contribution over the prior art and the commonly shared structure does not constitute a structurally distinctive portion in view of the existing prior art. Thus, there is a lack of unity.

A prior art reference anticipating the claims with respect to one group would not render obvious the same claims with respect to another group. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103 (a) of the other invention.

6. Inventions I-XII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are drawn to different core structures, different methods of use.

Claim 11 is generic to the following disclosed patentably distinct species compounds of groups I-XII. The species are independent or distinct because as disclosed the different species have mutually exclusive characteristics for each identified species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species (***for searching purposes only***) for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or

employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

7. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one

or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

8. A telephone call was made to Mr. Michael Davis on 8/17/2009 and 8/12/2009 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kahsay Habte whose telephone number is (571) 272-0667. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9.00AM- 5:30PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson can be reached at (571) 272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 1624

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Kahsay T. Habte/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1624

August 18, 2009